

in many situations, and now that the backlog has been eliminated, it is correct, it would be more restrictive, it would have to go to the court, but that, of course, is what was contemplated in 1978. We do not believe that that would in any substantial way slow down the process and, therefore, not in any way put us at risk.

Having said all of that, we still agree with you that if we can get this done in a timely fashion that would be good.

I want to tell my friend, though, very candidly, I think there is some sentiment that if we don't get it done that that is going to put this side of the aisle that wants to look at this bill, after the Senate passes it back to us, with whatever provisions they include in it, carefully, we understand that we are going to be portrayed as somehow undermining the security of America. We think that argument is bogus, but we do think it may well be made.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, if I determine to make that argument, I will tell my friend, I will make it in good faith, and we do have a difference of opinion on this. Hopefully, the Senate will get its work done in a way that we will have a maximum amount of time in the relatively short time available here to look at this, and we won't have to have the argument about how critical that change is.

I personally believe that the 1978 law was written in a way where it was not anticipated that we would have to go to the FISA Court to listen to people in a foreign country who were making calls or communicating, and because of the way the law was written, it had come to mean that by now.

□ 2000

Mr. HOYER. I do want to make the point that I don't think we have much difference on that issue because we agree that technology has changed. As we all know, there is a switch here in the United States now that the 1978 law did not anticipate. Frankly, I don't think there is a great deal of contention. I think in a bipartisan fashion we believe that needs to be addressed. We addressed it in our bill and the Senate addressed it in their bill. Frankly, I don't think that is one of the items in contention.

In fact, I would suggest to my friend we could deal with the immunity issue, which looks back not at present capacity nor future capacity, and resolve that issue in a separate bill if that was the concern about going forward. I think that could be done relatively quickly.

My only point to the gentleman is I agree with you, technology has changed. I think there is bipartisan agreement we need to address that and facilitate the foreign-to-foreign intercept with a blanket approval simply related to process, and I think we could do that relatively easily because I don't think that is particularly contentious between us.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that, and we will see where we are next week,

and I look forward to the review that you and I will both have a chance to make of those documents.

You didn't mention it, but I heard there is a possibility we may take up an energy-related tax bill next week, something similar to the energy-related tax provisions that we had in the first year of this Congress in December of last year. I wonder if there is any information you can give me on that topic.

Mr. HOYER. There is a possibility we will be considering an energy bill much like some of the provisions that were included in H.R. 6 in the 6 for '06 package that we passed in the first 100 hours, and other portions of which were included in the energy bill that did not make it through.

I don't have specifics on that at this point in time, but that is being discussed and that is a possibility and he is correct.

Mr. BLUNT. So the schedule for next week is Tuesday through Friday, and we are looking at the items we discussed plus the possibility of other work that might come from the Senate.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously Friday is on the schedule. I expect we will be here on Friday. We have some other legislation on the suspension calendar. I don't know how extensive that will be.

Clearly we have been talking about FISA. FISA authorization ends on Friday. Again, we have a difference in perception of the consequences of that; but nevertheless, we have scheduled Friday so we are available depending on what the Senate does and depending on whether we can get to some agreement to ensure our presence to act on that, if possible.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESTAK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 6, 2008, at 9:35 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2457.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 5, 2008, at 1:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment; requests a conference with the House and appoints conferees H.R. 2419.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

HONORING OFFICER CHRISTOPHER RIDLEY

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 weeks ago Officer Christopher Ridley, age 23, of the Mount Vernon New York Police Department saw a street scuffle outside a county social services building in White Plains, New York. While off duty and in plain clothes, he drew his service weapon and attempted to break up the fight.

Unfortunately, officers from the Westchester County police also came upon the scuffle and tragically and mistakenly fired on Officer Ridley, who was killed.

Last week I attended the wake and funeral of Officer Ridley in the City of Mount Vernon, which is in my congressional district. Hundreds of local residents, police, and others from throughout the area turned out to pay their final respects. My heart goes out to Officer Ridley and his family by this terrible tragedy. One of our finest was